



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,902	08/02/2000	Jayant D. Patel	7784-000135	7985

7590 11/20/2002

Harness Dickey & Pierce PLC
PO Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303

EXAMINER

HOOK, JAMES F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/630,902

Applicant(s)
Patel

Examiner
James F. Hook

Art Unit
3752



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James F. Hook

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Joshua Dobrowitsky (51,288 Applicant's Rep.)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 19, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 16, 18, and 25

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

discussed the interpretation of the examiners rejection with respect to the claims recited above. It was discussed that additions to claim 1 with respect to the collar being a discrete element would overcome the reference to Caplan in that Caplan has a collar that is part of the continuing reinforcing spiral and not a discrete element, however, it is not clear at this time if such will put the claim in condition for allowance in light of the patent to Moore and the fact that specific claim language is not available at this time. With respect to claims 16 and 18, it was discussed that the reference to Sindars is modifying a method step of forming a pipe of a plurality of pieces, however, it is possible that the reference doesn't clearly teach bonding, but such may not be allowable in light of further consideration of the reference and possible new rejection with another piece of art directed more toward an actual bonding procedure. The addition of claim 17 to 16 would appear to be allowable. Claim 25, however, does not require bonding and further language would be required, as will further search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

JAMES F. HOOK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3752

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required